DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 402 EA 029 631

AUTHOR Counts, George E.; Shepard, I. Sue; Farmer, Richard F.
TITLE Evaluation and Supervision of Teachers in Missouri Schools.
PUB DATE 1998-00-00
NOTE 52p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Performance Based Assessment; *Principals; School Administration; *School Supervision; State Standards; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Missouri

ABSTRACT

Reform legislation enacted by the 1983 General Assembly in Missouri prompted the development of guidelines for Performance Based Teacher Evaluation (PBTE) in order to improve education. This paper presents a study that examined principals' use of PBTE. For the research, 180 principals from elementary-school, middle-school, and secondary-school populations, ranging in size from 100 to 1,199 students, were surveyed. The survey questions explored traditional versus constructivist views of learning and thinking, and examined teachers and principals in a supervisory relationship. The survey asked such questions as, Is the PBTE process or a variation of that process in general use? and Are principals generally supportive of the "official" PBTE process? A total of 81 returned surveys were usable. Results were grouped by school size--100-299, 300-599, 600-1,199--and by school level. The respondents were primarily male (72 percent) and had used the PBTE process as a principal for 2 or more years. The principals demonstrated widespread support for several constructivist beliefs about teaching and learning. It seems likely that observation of teachers by principals may have achieved representative rule status and that this is a major accomplishment of the reform era. It is recommended that the current PBTE process be phased out. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 427 402

Evaluation and Supervision of Teachers in Missouri Schools

George E. Counts
I. Sue Shepard
Richard F. Farmer

Southeast Missouri State University

One University Plaza, MS5550

Cape Girardeau, MO 63701

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

I. S. Shepard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 029 631

EVALUATION AND SUPERVISION OF TEACHERS IN MISSOURI SCHOOLS

Assessment of faculty performance in Missouri school districts has become a more time consuming task for principals and assistant principals. Reform legislation enacted by the 1983 General Assembly (Section 168.128 RSMo) specified that teacher assessments were to be conducted on the basis of a comprehensive treatment of job performance. This legislation required that the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) was to prepare "suggested procedures for such an evaluation." The State Board of Education approved this set of guidelines for Performance Based Teacher Evaluation (PBTE) in February of 1984; however, the 1983 statute authorized local districts to develop and use a different procedure. Given widespread adoption of this new process, subsequent efforts were made to help insure that principals could use PBTE effectively. (Similar forms with performance standards were created for assessing librarians and counselors . Also a performance appraisal process for school administrators, principals and superintendents was mandated by the 1985 legislature. These processes are only of secondary interest in this report and therefore were not separately critiqued.)

The Missouri PBTE manual discusses both formative and summative evaluation, but it advances only a single process for both types of evaluation. This is a fatal flaw if the purpose of a formative focus is performance improvement. A surface reading of the manual could lead one to conclude that the primary purpose of PBTE is the improvement of teaching effectiveness. Teaching effectiveness is a vital concern to administrators of course, but research in this field has not supported the notion that formative efforts should be conducted under "threat" of job targets as required by the summative process recommended by the DESE manual. This manual recommends that formative data may serve as a basis for "administrative decision making" which includes summative evaluations. When data collected in the formative process will

eventually be used in developing the summative report, then the entire process becomes summative. Efforts to strengthen the visible summative process of evaluating teachers came at a cost of a weaker formative process or of eliminating any preexisting formative process.

PBTE has been in place for over ten years. Assessment of the PBTE process seemed to be overdue. Since principals are the assessors for teachers, they were selected for an initial survey effort. A stratified random sample of principals was selected from the public schools of the state. Elementary school principals, middle school principals, and secondary school principals were separate populations of interest. Vocational school directors were not included since student enrollment in these schools were reported in the secondary school category.

Some of the research questions (RQ) were as follows:

RQ 1. Is the PBTE process or a variation of that process in general use?

RQ 2. Are principals generally supportive of the "official" PBTE process?

RQ 3. Are principals within four years of retirement more negative?

RQ 4. Do principals believe that PBTE criteria have been verified with experimental studies?

RQ 5. Are principals aware that Hunter's model has been discounted by some subsequent research (see Slavin below)?

RQ 6. Is the instruction to limit the use of "exceeds expectations" generally followed and accepted?

RQ 7. Do principals believe there is some pattern of correspondence between PBTE performance and quality of learning environments for students?

RQ 8. If so, are they convinced that such quality is borne out by criterion-referenced test scores and standardized test scores of students?

RQ 9. Does the principal's commitment to traditional or Constructivist views

on teaching and learning help explain some of the response patterns?

RQ 10. Does the principal's commitment help explain the managerial or leadership approach of that principal in supervision of teachers?

RQ 11. Do principals accept or reject restriction of leadership to use of influence, rather than authority, on mutually acceptable changes?

RQ 12. Do principals regard formative or summative processes as their primary strength?

RQ 13. Are responses interpretable so that inferences can be made about the extent to which PBTE processes are regarded as a MOCK RULE, a PUNISHMENT RULE, or a REPRESENTATIVE RULE in Missouri schools?

RQ 14. Has the current process (PBTE or local) been changed since adoption?

RQ 15. Do principals favor changes from their existing process?

RQ 16. What percentage of current principals have had at least one professional development workshop on PBTE? more than one workshop?

Background

Supervision of teachers is generally understood, and accepted, among school professionals; however, supervision may be an unfortunate choice of words. Taken literally it suggests that one person, the person doing the supervision, has superior (super) vision during a classroom visit. The truth often is that the supervisor lacks training in the teacher's academic discipline and is unaware of content-specific strategies for learning and thinking (Noland & Francis, 1992) which the teacher needs (and may have and may use). In fact, the teacher may also have more years of experience in teaching as well as more recent experience with that age group of students. The "supervisor" may feel free to provide a critique based on traditional views of teaching and learning in spite of the fact that the teacher views teaching from a conflicting, Constructivist

mindscape (Noland & Francis, 1992). This same supervisor may be fully aware of the conflicting views between neo-progressives and neo-tradionalists (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1992) and still feel constrained to ignore personal beliefs and dispositions in order to support the bureaucratic, neo-traditional orientation of a state mandated model. Such a supervisor may be aware that the strengths of cooperative learning groups are many (including impressive achievement effects) and still be unwilling to observe a teacher unless the teacher is doing direct teaching. It does seem strange that one of a teacher's more powerful weapons in providing learning effects, cooperative learning, may not fit with an evaluative process supposedly designed to achieve these same effects.

Glickman (1992) suggested that the term, instructional supervision, has outlived its usefulness. Principals who have little if any tolerance for diversity of teaching approaches are likely to misuse authority. Such misuse erodes their effectiveness. Glickman indicated that the role of instructional leadership has shifted in a post-modernist era from a principal, a manager with bureaucratic authority, to a host of educators with substantial talent, including some teachers who are subordinates of the principal from a purely bureaucratic perspective.

In a brief historical sketch of supervision, Bolin & Panaritis (1992) included the following subheadings: Supervision as Inspection, Supervision as Social Efficiency, Supervision as Democratic Leadership. Given today's movement toward increased sophistication in supervisory efforts as well as educational theory, Missouri's existing PBTE approach appears to fit in the Inspection/Social Efficiency categories. Gleave (1997) described a "successful field test of a differentiated approach to development and appraisal." The Saskatoon Board of Education desired to achieve a cultural shift from rote learning and direct instruction to better options (from a transmissional emphasis to a transactional alternative). Since Missouri's new standards and

testing approaches emphasize higher order thinking skills, the State's styles of supervision should be compatible.

It seems likely that part of today's ferment in supervision theory stems from recent shifts in beliefs about leadership. Some authorities on leadership theory have seen no need to define leadership, and others have defined leadership but then used the term with clearly contradictory meanings (Rost, 1992). Rost argued that leadership differs from management since one depends on authority and the other is based on uncoerced influence. His definitions imply that leadership requires an influence relationship, that leaders and followers can be identified, and that results include a set of plans for lasting and significant change(s). Covey (1991) regarded leadership as part of management, but he argued that leadership was a "higher part" of management. This does have the effect of limiting leadership opportunity to those with managerial roles. The authors are reluctant to commit to a theoretical position which excludes managerial subordinates from leadership roles or which excludes the manager from leadership roles.

Beliefs about supervision are in a similar state of flux. Although an example of a principal or former principal with modern views and practices (Marshall, 1996; Hill, 1992) is easy to find, a contrary view (Evans, 1992) would limit the principal to summative evaluations and leave the formative assessments and professional development to the individual teacher supported by peers, an appropriate district supervision specialist, and a consultant with expertise from outside the district. Apparently, isolation of formative assessment from the principal is expected to permit teachers to become open and active in developing their own plans for professional growth. Perhaps the most extreme view on supervision is one of Starratt (1992) who proposed that supervision be abolished. While principals may be responding to public demands for more vigor

in assessing and releasing teachers, teachers and theorists with post-modernist views have been forging ahead toward empowerment and other alternatives to lingering essentialist practices of the 1980's.

Current uncertainty about what leadership is affects the interpretations which have been advanced concerning instructional leadership. Formative evaluation can be approached with a leadership outlook or with managerial authority. Summative evaluation is so clearly managerial that a leadership intent by the principal is likely to be either overlooked or misinterpreted by the subordinate. Lack of consensus on the nature of leadership permits too much latitude in supervisory approach. A principal who uses authority in all supervisory relationships tends to get, at best, surface changes and social isolation from work group members. Leadership relationships (influence-based) in supervision may be more difficult to achieve when the relationship excludes some members of the work group. The ability to regard each teacher as a supervisory coordinate (not a subordinate) except during summative evaluation is a difficult reach for many active principals. In addition, some superintendents can be expected to resist the formation of coordinative relationships between teachers and principals since that has implications for relationships between superintendents and principals.

A desire to be able to switch between leadership and management at will or to mix authority and influence may seem inexplicable to some; however, commitment in school environments is not without dangers. Every time a superintendent is replaced or new school board members are elected the potential for change is increased. Strong personal beliefs and public identification with, or opposition to, past practices creates winners and losers. Safety lies in lack of commitment and willingness to go along in spite of some significant reservations about past changes as well as new ones. Desire to avoid

risk creates blind followers who will desire to shift any future blame to the authority figure who "caused this mess." Those with excessive concern to avoid personal risks have little need for a valid definition for leadership.

While consistency between beliefs about leadership and beliefs about supervision is certainly desirable, decisions and commitments are often more emotional than logical (Gibbs, 1995). For example, Short and Greer (1997) discussed empowerment of teachers along with a traditional view of leadership. Traditional "leadership" theories tend to mix authority and influence (Counts, Farmer, & Shepard, 1994). Such theories permit the administrator to be as empowering, as power-hoarding, or as inconsistent as that individual chooses to be. Traditional definitions of supervision have been so generic [and, according to Bolin & Panaritis (1992), so ineffective in practice] that a variety of conflicts [similar to the tension between Barr and Burton postulated by Bolin & Panaritis] disappeared from view; however, the administrator was left with few constraints on any chosen action. Four alternatives exist among possible belief structures: 1) Traditional leadership definition and supervision preferences, 2) Post-industrial leadership definition and supervision preferences, 3) Traditional leadership definition in contrast with post-industrial supervisory preferences, and 4) Post-industrial leadership definition in contrast with traditional supervisory preferences. It seems likely that some of the variation in survey response patterns will stem from such beliefs and preferences.

Since conflicts continue on the nature of leadership and on an adequate theory of supervision, it is not surprising that actual practices at elementary and secondary schools in rural locations show ambiguous relationships between supervision, observation, and evaluation (Cairns, 1992). Cairns concluded that past research suggested that supervision is neither frequent nor rigorous, that teachers do not see principals as skilled in communicating how the teacher

should improve or in modeling new teaching techniques for the teacher, and that connections between the principal's evaluative efforts and actions taken by the principal to improve instruction are ill-defined in the minds of teachers.

Cairns argued that principals who view their role as management rather than instructional leadership will relegate the process of clinical supervision to the status of a "MOCK RULE," a rule which both teachers and administrators ignore except, perhaps, for appearances. He also pointed out that a principal who lacks the necessary skills to provide real clinical supervision may demonstrate the same behaviors regardless of the climate of opinion among teachers in the school. Schools in which clinical supervision is a mock rule may act in a similar fashion, but the reasons for such actions may differ. A belief that the state's PBTE has major flaws or that the responsibility for such a process should be left at the local level could cause a willingness to discount PBTE. Missouri principals who have had little or no training in PBTE style of observation and evaluation or who lack confidence in their ability to help a teacher at risk may never find the courage to see a need for a job target for any teacher under their "supervision."

Cairns is equally critical of principals who treat supervision as a PUNISHMENT RULE, a rule used to control subordinates in a "top-down" organization. A principal who believes that PBTE was intended as a housecleaning mechanism and who fears that failure to fire a teacher is an indicator of ineffectiveness on his/her part or who derives personal satisfaction from capricious exercises of power will have strong negative effects on morale and trust. A teacher's fear or indecision may undercut effectiveness.

Cairns argued that the ideal environment is one in which supervision is a REPRESENTATIVE RULE, a rule which is recognized by both teachers and the principal as reflecting the core values of educators. While it would be convenient

if schools with evidence that neither a punishment rule or a mock rule is operational could be regarded as operating under a representative rule, such a conclusion seems premature. A principal with the desired rule is likely to regard formative evaluation and helping such teachers as personal strengths. This type of principal may be more successful if this individual and the teachers are committed to a conception of leadership based on influence rather than authority. While Cairns limited the scope of such rules to rural settings, generalizing to a more urban environment does not seem to be inappropriate.

Gleave (1997) addressed some of the leadership/management concerns in a recent description of practices of the Saskatoon Board of Education. Four styles of supervision are described in this article---Facilitating, Collaborating, Negotiating, and Directing. Missouri's PBTE process does not address style of supervision. Principals who use one basic approach for untenured and tenured faculty may tend to convey an impression of "directing." Principals who are willing to consider other styles may discover more than the four listed above.

The Directing Style is clearly managerial. It was suggested for those in need of severe remediation. A strength of the approach is that the intention is to assist teachers who need this style to progress to a more congenial alternative.

The Facilitating and Collaborating Styles convey an idea that a leadership relationship is intended. Gleave's description of these two alternatives clearly indicates that facilitation is reserved for "master" teachers. Principals who work with master teachers act as coaches. The teacher is expected to reflect, to describe experiences, and to demonstrate critical thinking and creative problem solving (with some assistance). An intent is teacher empowerment. Collaboration requires a more active role for the principal and/or peer(s). Candidates for this style are expected to be highly motivated but less

experienced.

The Negotiating Style is seen as appropriate for teachers who have strong skills but lack motivation in their current assignments. Although Gleave's assessment of this approach sounds transitional between management and leadership, it has a managerial tone. The principal's respect for a teacher's skills and potentials, if accurately conveyed, can give some leadership flavor to the relationship. Professional growth may permit some of these teachers to move directly to the Facilitating Style.

The Missouri PBTE assessment form consists of nineteen criteria. There are ten criteria for the instructional process, two criteria for classroom management, three for interpersonal relationships, and four for professional responsibilities. On each criterion a teacher is judged to fit best in one of four categories (above expectations, meeting expectations, somewhat below expectations, or well below the level of a satisfactory performance) or in a Not Observed category. In discussing the summative evaluation report, the category for the highest level of expectations is discussed in these terms: "The next column. . . represents exemplary performance for that criterion and would be typical of only a small percentage of the ratings given. This column should be used with prudence. . . " Willingness to conform with this directive was unknown.

The PBTE process, according to the manual, was based on research executed in Florida, in Georgia, and at Iowa State University and dates from the same general period as the Tennessee process described by Mertz and McNeely (1993). Their report on a survey of teachers documented that only three percent of respondents believed that their supervision had any purpose(s) other than evaluation. A comparable study of reactions from principals or from Missouri teachers was not identified.

In a recent article Cairns (1992) noted that a state's reform efforts often generated a single performance assessment form for use on a state-wide basis. Missouri's suggested PBTE form fits this formula and was endorsed for use in any public school district. Cairns regarded improved student performance as the justification for this emphasis on supervision and evaluation. It seems obvious that a form designed to put ineffective teachers at risk or to focus remedial efforts on improving those at risk offers questionable benefits to competent and truly outstanding teachers. A quicker route to excellence may be through recognition of strengths, developing such strengths to even higher levels, and capitalizing on those.

In addition to these nineteen criteria for performance on the Missouri form, the principal is expected to utilize the eight steps of the Hunter model for the act of teaching (Establishes Set, . . . Achieves Closure). Although Slavin (1989) raised doubts about the utility of the Hunter model, these steps remain part of the official model form in 1997. The nineteen criteria and the eight steps fit the traditional view of teaching and learning (that general commonalities apply across all subject fields and instructional levels).

Procedures

Population and sampling procedures. Three populations were of interest: elementary school principals, middle school principals, and secondary school principals. Within each population the schools were grouped into size categories based on the number of students attending the school (less than 100, 100-299, 300-599, 600-1199, 1200 or more). Within each size category, the number of "principals" (in some schools the person who supervises wears a different title) was determined and is shown below in Table 1. For each school type, twenty principals were selected from each of the three middle strata---100-299, 300-599, and 600-1199. Principals in very small schools (fewer than 100 students)

and in very large schools (more than 1199 students) were excluded from this survey. The total number of surveyed principals was 180 (60 from each school type---elementary, middle, and secondary).

Table 1

Number of Principals (and Sample Size) by School Size and School Type

School Size	Elementary Schools		Middle Schools		Secondary Schools	
1200-	5		4		55	
600-1199	112	(20)	73	(20)	123	(20)
300- 599	603	(20)	92	(20)	146	(20)
100- 299	421	(20)	49	(20)	227	(20)
- 99	103		4		69	
Total	1244	(60)	222	(60)	620	(60)

Survey Instruments. The questionnaire was six pages with three parts: a set of twenty-two questions for the respondent, a demographic section of twelve variables, and a set of fourteen Likert scaled items seeking fundamental beliefs about teaching and learning. The twenty-two questions were designed partly to satisfy the curiosity of the investigators and partly in response to conceptions from theory as described above. The first eleven Likert items explore traditional vs. constructivist views on learning and thinking (Noland & Francis, 1992). The other three items extend the constructivist view to teachers and principals in a supervisory relationship (leadership-based and/or management-based).

In an exploratory pilot of the Likert scale items, twelve Specialist level students responded with anonymity to a format where the first five items

reflected traditional views on learning/thinking and the next six were consistent with a constructivist view. None of these students were consistently traditional or constructivist; however, some were fairly consistent. The first eleven items were then reordered where conflicting views were more visible. Two of the last three items were restated to clarify the meaning.

A second pilot study was used in an attempt to improve the survey form before actual use. First, six principals or assistant principals (we excluded anyone who would receive an actual survey) were contacted who agreed to field test the form and determine the time required to respond. Each was asked if any questions were not clear and if they felt that any part(s) of the survey are likely to discourage participation. No concerns were identified. Estimates of the time required for completion of the survey was not possible according to some principals. Others ran from fifteen to forty minutes. Based on one response, an additional question was added to the demographics section on teaching field certifications held by the principal.

Collection of Data. A copy of the survey, the cover letter, and an informed consent form were mailed to each selected principal on March 15, 1997. The cover letter requested a return of the completed survey by the end of March. The informed consent page was to be mailed separately to a different address; however, a few returned it in the same mailing. Only those surveys received by August of 1997 were included in the results. No followup efforts were made although the participation rate was not fully satisfactory. An earlier mailing was intended, but that proved to be impossible to achieve.

Analysis of the Data. After completed surveys were received, each was scanned to determine if data were usable. The total number of returned surveys was eighty-one. Informed consent forms were placed in a separate file.

Written responses to an item of "other" were recoded to one of the

standard responses if appropriate in the judgment of the researchers. Next, standard responses were tallied and the remaining "other" responses were counted and characterized appropriately. Similar responses were combined into a set of general responses. Tables were constructed as an aid to communication of the results. Text was written as an aid to interpreting the results and to identifying the more dramatic trends. Tables were ordered to support coherence for the reader. Percentages in selected categories were determined and included in the text where this seemed appropriate.

Results

Response Rate and Demographics. The response rates by school type and size are summarized below in Table 2. As shown below, twenty-seven principals responded from target elementary, middle, and secondary settings; however, there were variations within the size of school category. The response rates

Table 2

Number of Respondents and Percentage Responding by School Size and School Type

School Size	Elementary Schools		Middle Schools		Secondary Schools	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
600-1199	10	50	7	35	9	45
300- 599	7	35	8	42*	8	40
100- 299	10	50	12	55	10	50
Total	27	45	27	46*	27	45

*Adjusted for the fact that one survey was mailed, returned, but not remailed.

within size of school ran from 35 to 55 percent of those surveyed. These differences were presumed to represent only chance factors, i.e. random sampling variations.

Table 3 below contains a summary from the demographic section of the survey. The eighty-one respondents were primarily male (72 percent), typically reported 5 to 15 years of teaching experience before becoming a principal (53 percent), and had used the PBTE process as a principal for two or more years (only 10 percent reported less use). Less than fifty percent of the respondents had been a principal before the PBTE process was instituted. Only eight of the principals (10 percent) were graduates of one of the schools within the school district. Twenty-seven percent of these principals were less than five years from retirement. They recorded a high percentage of certifications in the following teaching fields---social studies/English, mathematics/science, physical education, and elementary education.

One of the original interests was assessing the extent to which schools were using locally developed forms, modified PBTE forms, or the complete package of PBTE forms suggested by DESE. The survey form requested information about the assessment tool in use and also if there were alternate processes for tenured and untenured teachers. Principals from these reporting schools were apparently all using either a duplicate of the state PBTE form (44 principals of 81: 54 percent) or a variation of this standard form (37 principals or 46 percent). Of the 79 who described local assessment for tenured and untenured teachers, only one explained a variation for a tenured teacher. This principal used a professional development plan as a supplement to the regular form. Since the survey question failed to specify such use as a variation, this may be more common among these 79 schools than the responses show.

Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents by School Type

Characteristic Group	Elementary N	%	Middle N	%	Secondary N	%	All N	%
Gender								
Female	7	26	5	19	6	22	18	22
Male	15	56	22	81	21	78	58	72
No response	5	19					5	6
Years of teaching experience before appointment as a principal								
0-4	5	19	4	8	3	11	12	15
5-15	13	48	16	59	14	52	43	53
over 15	4	15	7	26	8	30	19	23
No response	5	19			2	7	7	9
Years of experience as a principal using PBTE assessment								
0-1	2	7	2	7	4	15	8	10
2-9	8	30	18	67	10	37	36	44
over 9	12	44	7	26	12	44	31	38
No response	5	19			1	4	6	7

Table 3 Continued

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents by School Type

Characteristic Group	Elementary N	%	Middle N	%	Secondary N	%	All N	%
Years of experience as a principal before the PBTE form existed								
Yes	10	37	10	37	12	44	32	40
No	12	44	17	63	14	52	43	53
No response	5	19			1	4	6	7
Number of years until retirement								
0-4	3	11	9	33	10	37	22	27
5-15	15	56	14	52	16	59	45	56
over 15	4	15	4	15	1	4	9	11
No response	5	19					5	6
Principal was a graduate of at least one school in the school district								
Yes	2	7	4	15	2	7	8	10
No	20	74	23	85	24	89	67	83
No response	5	19			1	4	6	7

Table 3 Continued

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents by School Type

Characteristic	Elementary		Middle		Secondary		All	
Group	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Missouri teaching field certifications held by the principal								
Social Studies or English	3	11	10	37	12	44	25	31
Mathematics or Science	2	7	9	33	10	37	21	26
Physical Education	1	4	9	33	11	41	21	26
Music or Art	1	4	2	7	1	4	4	5
Vocational Fields			2	7	2	7	4	5
Special Education	1	4	1	4	1	4	3	4
Elementary Education	16	59	2	7	1	4	19	23
Audiovisual, Kindergarten, & Remedial Reading	1	4					1	1
None of these	1	4	1	4			2	2

Stability of the Assessment Process. Three questions from the survey explored past stability of the assessment process and the current climate for change of the process. Table 4 summarizes the number of changes reported by the eighty-one principals. Twenty-two percent of the principals either did not know or failed to respond. Only 35 percent reported that the process was unchanged from its original form. Twenty principals, 25 percent, specified more than one change, and fifteen, 19 percent, listed a single change since inception.

Table 4

Number of Times the Local Assessment Process has Changed by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All	%
None	11	7	10	28	35
Once	3	7	5	15	19
More than once	4	7	9	20	25
Unknown	4	6	3	13	16
No response	5			5	6
Total	27	27	27	81	

Two other questions permitted the principal to indicate if the PBTE process was currently a target for change and if the respondent personally favored such change. Table 5 provides a summary of the responses to the first question. Nineteen principals (or 23 percent) agreed that this was true, and five failed to respond. All of the nineteen personally favored change (see Table 6 below) except for four (three opposed it, and one was undecided). Although the

question summarized in Table 6 was not intended to secure a response from those principals where change was unanticipated, many responded and eight additional principals reported that they personally were ready for a change. The weak trend across elementary, middle, and secondary levels was noted, but no interpretation was attempted.

Table 5

The Local Assessment Process is a Target for Change by School Level

Response	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All	%
Yes	4	6	9	19	23
No	18	21	18	57	70
No response	5			5	6
Total	27	27	27	81	

Qualifications for Completing an Assessment. Principals in Missouri schools have a variety of strengths which they use in completing both formative and summative assessments of teachers. This may include the experience of prior PBTE assessment within a teaching role, some local and/or state training in workshops, prior experience with alternative forms of assessment, or experiences with a PBTE style assessment in the principal's role from the superintendent's office.

Perhaps one of the most telling experiences with the PBTE process is as a teacher being observed in the classroom. Such teachers who then become principals with the obligation to observe and complete the procedure on other

Table 6

Principal's Attitude Toward Such Changes by School Level

Response	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Response of Yes in Table 5				
Principal Favored Change	3	5	7	15
Principal Opposed to Change		1	2	3
Principal was Undecided	1			1
Response of No in Table 5				
Principal Favored Change	3	3	2	8

teachers may have an additional appreciation for the nuances of the methodology. The survey allowed principals to report prior experiences with the PBTE or an alternative process before employment as a principal in the current school (the results are in Table 7 below). The strongest preparation for observing teachers may be provided by prior experience with both the PBTE approach and any contrasting procedure. Five of the principals (6 percent) reported such strengths. Thirty-three principals (41 percent) described the prior experience of a PBTE teacher observation. The total number of principals with such PBTE backgrounds was thirty-eight, or 47 percent. Another thirty-six principals (44 percent) listed similar experiences but limited to a different methodology. Seven principals (9 percent) indicated that observation by a principal while teaching was outside their direct experiences (none of the seven were elementary principals).

Table 8 provides a summary concerning attendance at workshops directed by Dr. Jerry Valentine or others. Seventy-eight percent of these principals had completed one or more PBTE workshops with Dr. Valentine, and thirty-one percent had completed such workshops with other presenters. Only nine

Table 7

Principal's Prior Experience with the PBTE Process in a Teaching Role by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Experienced the PBTE process	10	12	11	33
Experienced a different process	13	11	12	36
Experienced both process types	4		1	5
Never experienced such a process		4	3	7
Total	27	27	27	81

percent of the responding principals (7) were interpreted as having no prior workshop attendance. This may be a little high since those who failed to respond on this part of the survey but who responded to other components of the demographic section were included in these seven. Clearly this table reflects the level of professional development effort devoted to support of the PBTE approach. It seems doubtful that the state-wide population is significantly different from the respondents. Note that the mode for the responding group is two or more workshops with Dr. Valentine.

The intent of another survey question was to determine if assessments of teachers were actually made before the completion of appropriate PBTE training.

Table 9 below provides a basis for interpretation. Fifteen principals were trained on use of the local form before any local teacher assessments were completed. Fourteen (17 percent) were not trained on the local or PBTE form; however, forty-seven (58 percent) were trained in the PBTE workshops. Five (6 percent) were trained on both forms before assessment were made. The seventeen

Table 8

Number of Workshops Completed on the PBTE Process by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All	%
With Dr. Valentine					
None	5	6	2	13	16
One	7	13	9	29	36
More than one	10	8	16	34	42
No response	5			5	6
With others					
None	14	18	19	51	63
One	5	6	5	16	20
More than one	3	3	3	9	11
No response	5			5	6
With no one	4	2	1	7	9
Total	27	27	27	81	

percent who were not trained at all comprise the "high risk" group.

An alternative for principals with no prior PBTE based teacher evaluation is to experience a similar process within the principal's role. Since a state model exists for such evaluations, a survey question was provided to find out if it was used by the principal's immediate supervisor---typically the superintendent. The results were tabulated and are summarized in Table 10. Three principals reported that they were unaware of the state model. Twenty-seven (33 percent) reported that the model was not used (marginally more of these were elementary principals). Forty-nine of the eighty-one principals (60 percent)

Table 9

Principal's Training for Teacher Assessment Before Completing Classroom Visits by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Received training on the local form	4	5	6	15
Received training on the PBTE process	14	15	18	47
Received training on both processes	2	1	2	5
Received no training	7	6	1	14
Total	27	27	27	81

Table 10

Principal's Superintendent Utilized a PBTE Style Evaluation by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Yes	14	18	17	49
Yes, to some degree or sometimes	1	1		2
No	11	8	8	27
Unaware of a state model for principals	1		2	3
Total	27	27	27	81

reported such use, and two additional principals (2 percent) reported either occasional use or use to some extent.

Since PBTE assessment in the principal's role might be expected to influence the principal's approach to teacher assessment, a question permitted the principals to describe the extent to which they felt this happened. Table 11 is the relevant source for interpretation. Only five of the fifty-one principals (10 percent) reported that their PBTE as a principal influenced subsequent PBTE teacher assessments. Unfortunately, a similar question was not structured for the survey which provided similar information about the influence of experiences described in Table 7.

This paragraph can be interpreted to some extent as a digression from our focus on the principal assessing teachers; however, a more detailed understanding of PBTE assessment on a district-wide basis results. Although

Table 11

Influence of the Principal's PBTE Style Evaluation on Teacher Assessments by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
No influence on assessments	13	18	15	46
Influence on assessments	2	1	2	5
Total	15	19	17	51

direct knowledge of procedures used by the school board in assessing the superintendent is not universal among principals within districts, a survey question requested information on use of a PBTE process by the board with the superintendent as the recipient. Table 12 summarizes these responses. Twenty-one responders (26 percent) stated that they did not know. Forty-four of the group (54 percent) indicated that such a PBTE process was in use. Since 62 percent of the principals were PBTE evaluated, the percentages are similar. Given the fact than only about three of every four respondents appeared to know how the superintendent is assessed, the actual percentage could be substantially higher. A direct study with superintendents as respondents would of course provide a stronger estimate of the state-wide status.

Knowledge and Use of PBTE Process. Three questions from the survey addressed the principal's professional knowledge base and the principal's use of the "Exceeds Expectations" column in the standard PBTE form. The first of the knowledge base questions asked if the principal assumed that each of the nineteen criteria of the PBTE process had been demonstrated in experiments as

Table 12

Local School Board Uses a PBTE Style Process in Evaluation of the Superintendent by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All	%
Yes	12	12	20	44	54
No	7	7	2	16	20
Do not know	8	8	5	21	26
Total	27	27	27	81	

an influence on student achievement. The summarized responses are below in Table 13. Sixty-six principals (81 percent) agreed that experimental verification was assumed. Eleven of this group (14 percent) reported that such was not true. Three respondents elected not to respond to this item. The remaining response was an indication that there was not time in 1984 to conduct such research. It is true that several years have passed without visible additional attempts to verify strengths or weaknesses with experimental data.

Table 14 gives the summary derived from responses of the principals to the other knowledge base question---awareness of research reported in 1989 which indicated that teacher use of the Hunter model failed to improve student achievement. Twenty-eight of the eighty-one principals (35 percent) agreed that they were aware of such research. Twenty-nine of the group, 36 percent, checked the alternative, Did not know but not surprised. Thirteen principals were unaware of the research and distrusted the results, and nine others were vague or gave no firm opinions.

Table 13

Principals Assumed that Each of the Nineteen PBTE Criteria had been Validated in Experimental Studies by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Yes	18	24	24	66
No	8	1	2	11
Was not time to conduct research in 1984		1		1
No response	1	1	1	3
Total	27	27	27	81

Principals were also asked to indicate on the survey form if the limitation of the "exceeds expectations" to at most 5 percent was routinely followed or not. Table 15 is based on a summary of their responses. Sixty-one responses (75 percent or three out of every four principals) indicated a personal willingness to deviate from the directive. Seven principals supported the intent of the form and were unwilling to deviate, and an additional three principals followed the form but had reservations about doing so. One (and perhaps others who were not fully descriptive of actual practices) reported that such exceeds expectations designations were limited to those teachers who have an active professional development plan. It appears from this response that the principal only tries to reach a decision concerning excellence in those cases where a professional development plan forces such a consideration. Ten of the principals gave written responses in lieu of the three alternatives structured by

Table 14

Reactions to Slavin's Research on the Hunter Model by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Knew about prior research	8	10	10	28
Did not know but not surprised	5	11	13	29
Did not know and distrusted the results	6	4	3	13
Other (Some responses avoid the issues)	4	2	1	7
Other (No firm opinions)	2			2
Total	27	27	27	81

the researchers.

Overall Response to the Existing Process. Four survey items allowed principals to assess aspects of the PBTE process from their perspectives. The results in Table 16 describe the principal's assessment on the extent to which PBTE results were consistent with significant aspects of the teacher's classroom culture. Twenty-seven from the group (33 percent) agreed that PBTE assessments are consistent with MMAT (Missouri Mastery Achievement Test) and standardized test scores. Twenty-four principals (30 percent) reported consistency with the general disciplinary tone of the classroom (but not with test scores). Six were willing to concede consistency with both of these (disciplinary tone and test results). On a more negative note, sixteen (20 percent) verified that consistency with test scores was lacking, and one principal was convinced that the PBTE process was inconsistent with both aspects. One respondent regarded the question as one which was too difficult to

Table 15

Willingness to Deviate from the Limitation on Exceeds Expectations by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Unwilling to deviate (Support)	2	2	3	7
Feel free to deviate	17	24	20	61
Follow but have reservations	2		1	3
Other (Requires a professional development plan)	1			1
Other (Response ignored the specifics of the question)		1		1
Other	5		3	8
Total	27	27	27	81

answer. Multiple responses from some respondents were helpful but made tabulation more complex.

Perhaps a more relevant item to principals was the one assessing the correspondence between PBTE results and student achievement. Table 17 reflects their responses. An equal number of principals (37 or 46 percent) conceded that 1) there was a general correspondence between these two variables, PBTE results and achievement of the teacher's students, or 2) there was some correspondence between results and achievement. Five other principals (6 percent) were more critical---they saw little correspondence.

Table 16

Validation of Effects of the Missouri PBTE Model by School Level

Effect	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Are consistent with MMAT and standardized test scores	10	10	7	27
Are consistent with test scores and with disciplinary tone (see below)	2	1	3	6
Are inconsistent with such results	5	6	5	16
Are consistent with the general disciplinary tone of classroom	8	7	9	24
Are inconsistent with test scores, but consistent with classroom tone	1	1		2
Are inconsistent with this tone and with test scores			1	1
Too difficult to answer			1	1
Other (Some ambiguous responses)	1	2	1	4
Total	27	27	27	81

Table 17

Principal's Judgment as to the Relationship Between the PBTE Process and Student Achievement by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
General correspondence	15	10	12	37
General correspondence forced by the principal	1			1
Some correspondence	9	14	14	37
Little correspondence	1	3	1	5
Other	1			1
Total	27	27	27	81

Although primary justifications for the utility of the PBTE process would seem to rest on effects on student achievement, some attention to effects on teachers is appropriate. Table 18 provides the most relevant information on this aspect. Over half of the principals (42 or 52 percent) regarded the process as good for all teachers. Twenty-two (27 percent) reported that they agreed that the process was too generic and simple to do justice to a complex profession. Four principals agreed that PBTE is a weaker process for tenured teachers. Few of the principals thought that the process was better for some levels of teaching than for others. Eight provided written responses reflecting a variety of viewpoints. At least some of the eight appeared to these authors to be noncommittal.

Table 18

Principal's Attitude Toward the Missouri PBTE Model by School Level

Attitude	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Good for all teachers	16	11	15	42
Good for all but a deficiency model, not a growth model	1			1
Not as good for tenured teachers		3	1	4
Better for elementary teachers	1			1
Better for secondary teachers	1		1	2
Too generic and simple	6	7	9	22
Other (Some avoided the issues)	2	5	1	8
No response		1		1
Total	27	27	27	81

Since principals who are nearing retirement may have differed from the other principals in responding to this item, a separate analysis was made which excluded principals who reported they were not retiring within four years. Table 19 was the result. Contrasting Tables 18 and 19 shows that retiring principals are more confident, by approximately 16 percentage points, that the PBTE process is good for all teachers than the total group including the retirees. They also were somewhat less inclined to take the time required to give a written response instead of checking one provided in the survey, and were less likely to believe that the PBTE process is too generic and simple (by 9 percentage points).

Table 19

Attitude of Retiring Principals Toward the Missouri PBTE Model by School Level

Attitude	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Good for all teachers	2	6	7	15
Not as good for tenured teachers		1		1
Better for elementary teachers				
Better for secondary teachers				
Too generic and simple	1		3	4
Other		1		1
No response		1		1
Total	3	9	10	22

Leadership and Management Roles of the Principal and Teachers. Several questions provided principals with opportunities to reflect professional beliefs that relate to leadership and management within the school context. One item explored the principal's willingness to accept and apply a leadership definition (the ability to influence mutually acceptable changes in a school setting without use, or perhaps the opportunity to use, bureaucratic authority) to the school (the principal needs to be a leader of leaders---teachers). Results are below in Table 20. Seventy-six (94 percent) of the eighty-one principals agreed. The other five responses probably all reflect at least some disagreement. This implies a far stronger consensus than was expected. Perhaps the full implications of the question was not apparent to all respondents.

Table 20

Willingness to Accept and Apply a Leadership Definition to Teachers and Principals in a School Setting by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Agreed	24	27	25	76
Disagreed	1		1	2
Saw changes as limited by the teacher	1			1
Expressed confusion about meaning			1	1
No response	1			1
Total	27	27	27	81

Since the bias of the researchers is a willingness to argue that formative assessments should be regarded as a leadership role of the principal rather than a managerial effort in which a principal's resort to authority is fully appropriate, one interest was in the extent to which principals regarded formative assessments or summative judgments as a primary strength. Table 21 documents that fifty principals (62 percent) indicated formative assessments as a primary strength. Hopefully formative assistance is also intended. Twenty-five other principals (31 percent) gave a self-assessment of summative judgments as stronger than formative ones. One principal stated that he/she was equally adept at either and that the two should not be separated. This could mean that this individual proposes to do both formative and summative processes with equally heavy doses of administrative authority.

Table 21

Principal's Judgment as to Her/His Primary Strength in the PBTE Process by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Formative assessments	20	15	15	50
Summative judgments	5	9	11	25
Both (should not be separated)	1			1
Both	1		1	2
Other		2		2
No response		1		1
Total	27	27	27	81

Two survey items asked for the principal's judgment about measurable effects from personal supervisory efforts on student achievement---within the PBTE process and outside that process. Table 22 has the summary for both items. For the within the PBTE component, fifty-six principals (69 percent) responded with the yes alternative or a meaning of essentially that alternative. Twenty-four (30 percent) had contrary opinions (No or Not sure). For the component outside of the PBTE effort, seventy-seven (95 percent) gave a yes response. Only four said No or failed to respond. This probably infers greater confidence in the supervision which is not directly tied to the PBTE process. The researchers interpret this disparity between effects as an indication that leadership relationships with teachers are more likely outside the PBTE process and effect on student accomplishments is part of the long-term influence.

Table 22

Principal's Judgment about Measurable Effects of Personal Supervisory Efforts on Student Achievement by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Within PBTE process				
Yes	20	17	18	55
Yes, to some extent	1			1
No	5	9	7	21
Not sure	1		1	2
Not sure (New principal)		1		1
Other (Some teachers need it but not all)			1	1
Outside PBTE process				
Yes	25	26	26	77
No	2	1		3
No response			1	1
Total	27	27	27	81

A similar item allowed the principal to report effects on relationships with teachers from the principal's supervisory efforts. (Note: This is more general than just the PBTE supervision.) A detailed summary is below in Table 23. Forty-six or 57 percent of the principals agree that such supervision consistently improved relationships with faculty members. Twenty-nine reported that

supervision had no effect on such relationships. Two others agreed that relationships were hampered, and one lamented the hampering effect on ineffective teachers. The survey instrument provided no direct check on the extent to which hampering is a result of managerial authority being misused on formative supervision of teachers. If a larger group had objected to the leadership definition of Table 20, analysis would have been attempted.

The researchers were of the opinion that leadership in formative processes is an inadequate focus in PBTE efforts and that administrative authority in summative evaluation is appropriate and unavoidable unless the assessor abdicates this major responsibility. Ideally, formative processes would allow full and free communication between the teacher and principal. A survey item addressed the extent to which the principal recognized teacher reluctance to be forthcoming in formative evaluations, and the responses are summarized below in Table 24. The modal response---saw only minor problems---was chosen by thirty-nine principals (48 percent). Almost as many principals, (thirty or 37 percent) did not see problems in this regard. Ten principals recognized major problems of this type, and two others limited the problem to the untenured teacher. The ten principals who recognized major effects on teachers may not be using leadership at all in supervision or may be using it inappropriately. Principals who were oblivious to any such problem may have a frame of reference which places all supervision within the managerial area---an exercise of the authority of the principal.

Table 23

Assessment of the Effect on Relationships with Faculty Members from the Principal's Supervisory Efforts by School Level

Assessment	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Consistently improve relationships	15	14	17	46
Has no effect on relationships	9	12	8	29
Both helps and hurts relationships			1	1
Consistently hamper relationships		1	1	2
Hampers relationships with ineffective teachers	1			1
Other	1			1
No response	1			1
Total	27	27	27	81

Table 24

Extent to Which Principal Recognized a Reluctance of Teachers to be Forthcoming with Principals in Formative Evaluations by School Level

Number	Elementary	Middle	Secondary	All
Did not see problems	9	9	12	30
Saw only minor problems	15	13	11	39
Recognized major problems	3	3	4	10
Regarded problems as Restricted to Untenured Teachers		2		2
Total	27	27	27	81

Constructivist and Traditional Beliefs about Learning. The survey also included fourteen items in a concluding section which requested the responders to identify basic beliefs about the teaching and learning process. Response alternatives were Strongly Agree, Agree, Uncertain, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. Table 25 was generated from the responses. The number of principals who chose each alternative is in bold type in the table. The items are listed from a strongly supportive concensus (an index value of 1.67) to a somewhat negative reaction to the last item (this index was 3.56). The index was computed by assigning 1 to each Strongly Agree, 2 to each Agree, 3 to each Uncertain, 4 to each Disagree, and 5 to each Strongly Disagree and dividing the sum by the number of responses on the item. A range of index values between 1.0 and 1.49, 1.50 and 2.49, 2.50 and 3.49, or 3.50 and 4.49, were used to group

items together as similar. A detailed analysis of individuals on a constructivist scale and a traditionalist scale was intended; however, contradictory opinions were so common for so many individuals that this was not expected to be useful for this research effort.

In general Constructivist views were more widely acceptable to principals than was expected. Traditionalist views tended to have supporters and detractors. Exceptions to these generalities were 1) a constructivist belief that the important strategies for learning and thinking are more subject specific and less general than has been admitted in the past (the index value was 2.96 because of conflicting views plus 16 principals who were undecided), and 2) a traditionalist belief that learning results from the student's accumulating discrete facts and individual skills. Since principals were divided over the subject specific strategies for teaching and learning, it not surprising that they were similarly unable to agree that the principal must construct complex views about teaching and learning for different subjects as a supplement to more general views. The item which argued that teachers should actively construct their own views about teaching and learning was, to some extent, more acceptable to principals. The freedom and the obligation to do more than accept the findings from research and the views of experts in the profession could have been read as a challenge to the expertise and authority of the principal in a supervisory context. Constructivist opinion would suggest that a teacher is going to exercise personal judgment during supervision, and little is gained from suppressing reasonable expressions of the teacher's reactions.

Since principals with constructivist views may be more likely to approach formative supervision with a leadership focus, the level of support for constructivist ideas is encouraging; however, the one constructivist idea which may be critical to a collegial approach in formative supervision also is the one

Table 25

Commitment of Principals to Traditional (T) and Constructivist (C) Beliefs

(Ordered from Most to Least Support by an Index)

N	Belief										Index
2.	Other than for rote memorization, learning requires active construction of meaning by the learner. **C**										
	28	S A	**42**	A		U	**2**	D		S D	**1.67**
4.	Specific concepts acquired by a student from instruction are influenced substantially by past learning and current beliefs/thoughts. **C**										
	19	S A	**52**	A	**1**	U		D		S D	**1.75**
14.	Empowerment of teachers is a role of the principal which also extends to the supervisory process. **EC***										
	14	S A	**45**	A	**6**	U	**7**	D		S D	**2.08**
9.	Cooperative learning groups provide significant advantages over direct instruction by a teacher. **C**										
	9	S A	**40**	A	**12**	U	**10**	D		S D	**2.32**
1.	Learning results from the student's accumulating discrete facts and individual skills. **T**										
	6	S A	**45**	A	**2**	U	**16**	D	**2**	S D	**2.41**
5.	A teacher should strive to help students revise their preexisting cognitive structures (methods of viewing or making sense of their surroundings, physical or mental). **C**										
	8	S A	**35**	A	**13**	U	**14**	D	**1**	S D	**2.48**

S A: Strongly Agree, A: Agree, U: Uncertain, D: Disagree, and S D: Strongly Disagree

*Items judged to be consistent with Constructivist beliefs.

Table 25 Continued

Commitment of Principals to Traditional (T) and Constructivist (C) Beliefs

(Ordered from Most to Least Support by an Index)

N	Belief	Index
12.	Teachers should actively construct their own views about teaching and learning rather than to just accept research results and the views of experts. **EC**	
	5 S A **37** A **10** U **18** D **1** S D	**2.62**
13.	Principals should expect that they must actively construct complex views about teaching and learning which are fairly specific to each subject field as a supplement to more general views. **EC**	
	2 S A **34** A **11** U **24** D **1** S D	**2.83**
7.	Since learning is an active process of the student which can not be delegated, actions of the teacher are inadequate substitutes for the work of any student. **C**	
	5 S A **24** A **19** U **20** D **2** S D	**2.86**
11.	The important strategies for learning and thinking are more subject specific and less general than has been admitted in the past. **C**	
	2 S A **27** A **16** U **26** D **1** S D	**2.96**
8.	Quality environments for learning are characterized by the teacher talking to the entire class or a dialog between the teacher and individual students. **T**	
	1 S A **25** A **14** U **30** D **1** S D	**3.07**

S A: Strongly Agree, A: Agree, U: Uncertain, D: Disagree, and S D: Strongly Disagree

Table 25

Commitment of Principals to Traditional (T) and Constructivist (C) Beliefs

(Ordered from Most to Least Support by an Index)

N	Belief										Index
3.	A teacher's responsibility is to recreate his/her knowledge in the mind of each student. **T**										
	2	S A	**24**	A	**3**	U	**37**	D	**5**	S D	**3.27**
10.	The critical skills for learning or thinking are the same for all subject content areas. **T**										
	3	S A	**18**	A	**7**	U	**42**	D	**2**	S D	**3.31**
6.	A teacher's central goal is changing the behavior of students. **T**										
	3	S A	**6**	A	**15**	U	**44**	D	**4**	S D	**3.56**

S A: Strongly Agree, A: Agree, U: Uncertain, D: Disagree, and S D: Strongly Disagree

which is most controversial---that strategies for learning and thinking are more subject specific than previously admitted. Perhaps the source of the observed conflicts on traditionalist beliefs is that not all principals can be expected to have been exposed to workshops or other professional preparation which included careful attention to Constructivist approaches. Also it is possible that consistency of beliefs along either traditional or constructivist lines is viewed as a vice rather than a virtue. Consistency of belief does not exist in the group, and it is atypical for individuals as well.

Discussion

The fact that the Missouri PBTE model was not tested with empirical

experiments before adoption or during the thirteen subsequent years is difficult to explain. It is traditional to lament the status of educational research when a need for experiments is suggested, and there is some validity to that point of view. It is more difficult to justify past inaction since adoption (1984 to date). Today, model building is still in vogue. Unless funding can be generated to provide an adequate empirical test of a revised process, change should not be attempted. While change or stability of supervisory processes may be negotiable, empirical testing with rigorous methodology of the result should not be optional.

Although an intent was to determine if responses were interpretable in such a way that inferences could be made about the extent to which Missouri's PBTE processes are regarded as a MOCK RULE, a PUNISHMENT RULE, or a REPRESENTATIVE RULE in individual school districts, no firm conclusions were drawn. The few principals who rejected the leadership definition may be more likely to have been operating under a punishment rule; however, PBTE has been widely regarded as intended to force ineffective teachers out of current school environments and ultimately out of the teaching profession. If true formative supervision is eliminated as a significant role of the principal and leadership in supervision is ignored in Leadership Academy workshops with a supervisory focus, wide variation in performance by principals should be expected. Our impression is that Hunterization of lessons by teachers in Missouri may be a mock rule (honored only when the principal makes a formal observation); however, this survey did not request information to determine if principals were of the opinion that this is prevalent. It seems likely that observation of teachers by principals may have achieved representative rule status in Missouri and that this is a major accomplishment of the reform era. Although this may be true, a belief that principal observations of tenured teachers is viewed as productive seems less likely to be true. Missouri teachers

may well share the belief of Tennessee teachers that evaluation is the sole purpose of the entire PBTE process (Mertz & McNeely, 1993).

Yes, principals must have authority and exercise it in the interests of the community and students. Although this seems obvious today, leadership is also a critical component of the successful principal. Acceptance and action by students and teachers can rarely be dictated. Wide acceptance of the definition of leadership from the survey suggests that almost all principals can use the term without compromising their belief structures. This is not to say that they never use the term leadership with a contradictory meaning. Even principals who would never admit that they forgo authority in any school setting except meetings with the superintendent, or other immediate superior, are doing leadership with both teachers and students in the sense of the definition. They also routinely function as a leader when parents visit their office with problems or complaints.

It seems obvious that both principals and DESE have a lot invested in the current process. Some reluctance to be really critical of the existing PBTE arrangements is certainly reasonable, but the real professional duty of principals is to the welfare of current and future students. Self-interest in avoiding changes in the current process, which they have mastered to their satisfaction, must compete with other considerations. The trauma of additional changes for Missouri schools under state-wide mandate may in fact drive out the opportunity to address even more significant local issues, even those which are widely shared across districts and schools. In light of these facts, the openness of the principals to change expressed on the survey is particularly commendable.

Principals in schools surveyed demonstrated wide spread support for several Constructivist beliefs about teaching and learning---probably with little background on theory. The one fundamental belief which gives direct support to

a principal's use of leadership-based supervision lacks consensus. Given the individual variation observed in the responses from principals, those who accept the critical one supporting leadership do not all agree on the other Constructivist items. Probably teachers and principals in Missouri schools would migrate to a set of consistent beliefs with exposure to a set of appropriate workshops, ideally within the local school setting.

Recommendations

Based on the discussion above, the following recommendations were developed:

1) The current PBTE process should be phased out in favor of a stronger model if significant funding for implementation and empirical testing is available. Any alternative process which is even more time consuming for principals can not be regarded as stronger. Principals need to work smarter, not harder.

2) Deficiency supervisory processes should not be used with tenured teachers unless removal is regarded as a real possibility. A side benefit here is elimination of some time currently required from the principal's schedule.

3. Time saved in 2 above should be invested, as needed, in long-term professional development plans which provide the context for formative supervision. The supervisory styles of Gleave (1997) should be explored.

4) Growth processes should be routine in formative processes with all teachers, untenured as well as tenured. The role of supervisor in formation supervision should not be restricted to the principal. The principal's efforts should be supplemented by at least one person chosen from the teacher's peers.

5) Leadership Academy workshops should be structured and delivered in two areas:

1) Leadership as an influence relationship between teachers and principals.

2) Implications of leadership and Constructivist beliefs about teaching and learning for formative supervision.

6) Empirical testing of any new supervisory model should include an assessment from principals of the total time required under the old system and the new. A goal should be saving time from past requirements.

References

Bolin, F. S., & Panaritis, P. (1992). Searching for a common purpose: A perspective on the history of supervision. In Glickman, C. D., (Ed.). (1992). Supervision in transition: 1992 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Cairns, D. V. (1992). Clinical supervision in rural schools: The key to more effective schools, Record in Educational Administration and Supervision, 13(1), 39-42.

Counts, G. E., Farmer, R. F., & Shepard, I. S. (1994). Leadership: Too elusive for definition? Journal of Leadership Studies, 2(3), 30-41.

Covey, S. R. (1991). Principle-centered leadership. NY: Summit Books.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Sclan, E. (1992). Policy and supervision. In Glickman, C. D., (Ed.). (1992). Supervision in transition: 1992 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

DESE. (1984). Guidelines for performance-based teacher evaluation in Missouri. Jefferson City, MO: Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education.

Evans, D. L. (1992). The "Instructional Leader" must go. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 350 649)

Gibbs, N. (1995). The EQ factor. Time, 146(14), 60-66, 68.

Gleave, D. (1997). Bifocals for teacher development and appraisal. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 12(3), 269-281.

Glickman, C. D. (1992). Introduction: Postmodernism and supervision. In Glickman, C. D., (Ed.). (1992). Supervision in transition: 1992 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria,

VA: ASCD.

Hill, C. (1992). Foreword. In Glickman, C. D., (Ed.). (1992). Supervision in transition: 1992 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Marshall, K. (1996). How I confronted HSPS (Hyperactive Superficial Principal Syndrome) and began to deal with the heart of the matter. Phi Delta Kappan, 77(5), 336-45.

Mertz, N. T., & McNeely, S. R. (1993). Expectations vs. realities: Supervision under a state-mandated teacher evaluation system. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 366 067)

Noland, J., & Francis, P. (1992). Changing perspectives in curriculum and instruction. In Glickman, C. D., (Ed.). (1992). Supervision in transition: 1992 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Rost, J. C. (1993). Leadership for the twenty-first century. Westport, CN: Praeger Publishers.

Shepard, I. S., Farmer, R. F., & Counts, G. E. (1995). Leadership definitions and theorists: Do practitioners and professors agree? Journal of Leadership Studies, 4(1), 26-45.

Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1997). Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Slavin, R. E. (1989). PET and the pendulum: Faddism in education and how to stop it. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 752-758.

Starratt, R. J. (1992). After supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 8(1), 77-86.